UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,288	08/30/2001	Michael Foley	05125.0001U1	1888

23859 7590 01/25/2008		EXAMINER	
NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C. SUITE 1000 999 PEACHTREE STREET ATLANTA, GA 30309-3915		TIV, BACKHEAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/944,288	FOLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Backhean Tiv	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _12/5/06_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _2,5,6,11-16 and 22-27_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _1,3,4,7-10 and 17-21_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _2,5,6,11-16 and 22-27_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 2,5,6,11-16,22-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1,3,4,7-10,17-21

have been cancelled in the Amendment filed on 12/5/06. This action is made **FINAL**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2,5,12-15,22,24,26,27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent 6,834,299 issued to Hamilton, II et al.(Hamilton) in view of

US Publication 2001/0047460 issued to Kobayashi et al.(Kobayashi) in further view of

admitted prior art.

As per claim 12, Hamilton teaches a system for automatically configuring a

diskless host computer(Abstract), comprising:

at least one diskless host computer that automatically boots an operating system as a

result of being connected to the network(Fig.5, col.5, lines 32-67);

a storage system on which are stored a plurality of host configurations, each

configuration including an operating system(Fig.5, col.6,lines 1-67); looking up a

configuration corresponding to the received identifier and directing the switch to provide

the diskless host computer access to a storage device on which the operating system is

stored(Abstract, col.7, lines 1-67).

Hamilton however does not explicitly teach diskless host computer being

physically connected to a network; a switch coupled to each diskless host computer and

having a plurality of ports, each port coupled to the storage system; and a control

station computer monitoring for receipt of an identifier transmitted by the diskless host

computer to the switch.

Kobayashi teaches a switch coupled to each diskless host computer and having

a plurality of ports, each port coupled to the storage system(Fig.1); and a control station

computer monitoring for receipt of an identifier transmitted by the diskless host

computer to the switch(Fig.1, para.0024,026).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the teachings of Hamilton to include a switch coupled to each

diskless host computer and having a plurality of ports, each port coupled to the storage

system; and a control station computer monitoring for receipt of an identifier transmitted

by the diskless host computer to the switch as taught by Kobayashi in order to remote

copy information(Kobayashi, para.0002).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings

of Hamilton and Kobayashi in order to remote copy information(Kobayashi, para.0002).

Admitted prior art explicitly teaches adding new devices to a SAN(Applicant

specification, page 1, line 10-page 3, line 9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the teachings of Hamilton in view of Kobayashi to include

adding new devices to a SAN as taught by applicant specification in order to replace and/or add new SAN devices to a network.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Hamilton, Kobayash, and admitted prior art in order to replace and/or add new SAN devices to a network.

As per claim 22, Hamilton teaches a method for automatically booting a diskless host computer upon being connected to a Fibre Channel network(Abstract), comprising: looking up a configuration corresponding to the received identifier, each configuration including an operating system different from the operating system of other configurations of the plurality of configurations(Fig.5, col.5, lines 32-col.6, lines 67); querying by a control station computer the Fibre Channel switch for the WWN(col.5, lines 31-67); looking up by the control station computer the configuration in a database in response to the WWN, each WWN having a corresponding configuration(Fig.5, col.5, lines 31-col.6, lines 67); providing the diskless host computer access to a storage device on which the operating system is stored(Fig.5, col.5, lines 32-col.6, lines 67); and the diskless host computer booting from the operating system stored on the storage device in response to being connected to network(Fig.5, col.5, lines 32-col.6, lines 67).

Hamilton however does not explicitly teach physically connecting the diskless host computer to the network; receiving at a Fibre Channel switch a World Wide Name (WWN) from the diskless host computer in accordance with a Fibre Channel log-in protocol.

Kobayashi teaches receiving at a Fibre Channel switch a World Wide Name

(WWN) from the diskless host computer in accordance with a Fibre Channel log-in

protocol (Fig.1, para.0024,026).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the teachings of Hamilton to include receiving at a Fibre Channel

switch a World Wide Name (WWN) from the diskless host computer in accordance with

a Fibre Channel log-in protocol as taught by Kobayashi in order to remote copy

information(Kobayashi, para.0002).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings

of Hamilton and Kobayashi in order to remote copy information(Kobayashi, para.0002).

Admitted prior art explicitly teaches adding new devices to a SAN(Applicant

specification, page 1, line 10-page 3, line 9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the teachings of Hamilton in view of Kobayashi to include

adding new devices to a SAN as taught by applicant specification in order to replace

and/or add new SAN devices to a network.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings

of Hamilton, Kobayash, and admitted prior art in order to replace and/or add new SAN

devices to a network.

As per claim 2, the method claimed in claim 22, further comprising the step of

prior to the step of providing the host access to a storage device, copying the operating

system to the storage device from another device of the storage system(Hamilton, Abstract, Fig.5).

As per claim 5, the method claimed in claim 22, wherein the control station queries the Fibre Channel switch in response to a notification received from the host via an Internet Protocol (IP) network(Hamilton, Abstract, Fig.5, Kobayashi, para.0024). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 22.

As per claim13, the system claimed in claim 12, wherein the storage system copies the operating system to the storage device from another device of the storage system(Hamilton, Abstract, Fig.5).

As per claim 14, the system claimed in claim 12, wherein the identifier is a World Wide Name (WWN) received from the host in accordance with a Fibre Channel log-in protocol, and wherein each WWN corresponds to a configuration(Hamilton, Abstract, col.5, line 32-67, Fig.1, para.0024,026). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 12.

As per claim 15, system claimed in claim 14, wherein the a control station computer queries the Fibre, Channel switch for the WWN and looks up the configuration in a database in response to the WWN(Hamilton, Fig.5, col.5, lines 31-col.6, lines 67).

As per claim 24, the method claimed in claim 23, wherein the network comprises an IP network(Kobayashi, para.0024). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 22.

As per claim 26, the method claimed in claim 23, wherein the network comprises a Fibre Channel network(Kobayashi, Abstract). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 22.

As per claim 27, the method claimed in claim 26, wherein the identifier is unique to an adapter used to connect the diskless computer to the network(Hamilton, col.5, lines 31-col.6, line 67).

As per claim 23, do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 12,22. Therefore claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 6,25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,834,299 issued to Hamilton, II et al.(Hamilton) in view of US Publication 2001/0047460 issued to Kobayashi et al.(Kobayashi) in further view of admitted prior art in further view of US Patent 6,810,478 issued to Anand et al.(Anand).

Hamilton in view of Kobayashi in further view of admitted prior art does not explicitly teach as per claims 6, 25, using DHCP protocol.

Anand teaches using DHCP protocol(col.43-50).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Hamilton in view of Kobayashi in further view of admitted prior art to include using DHCP protocol as taught by Anand in order to improve flexibility for configuration of computers attached to a network(Anand, col.1, lines 43-49)..

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Hamilton, Kobayashi, admitted prior art, and Anand in order to improve flexibility for configuration of computers attached to a network(Anand, col.1, lines 43-49).

Claims 11,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Patent 6,834,299 issued to Hamilton, II et al.(Hamilton) in view of US Publication

2001/0047460 issued to Kobayashi et al.(Kobayashi) in further view of admitted prior art

in further view of US Patent 6,343,287 issued to Kumar et al.(Kumar).

Hamilton in view of Kobayashi in further view of admitted prior art however does

not teach as per claim 11,16, wherein the database uses the lightweight directory

access protocol (LDAP).

Kumar teaches the use of LDAP for a database(Fig.3).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one ordinary

skilled in the art to modify Kobayashi in view of Hamilton in view of Kobayashi in further

view of admitted prior art to use LDAP for a database as taught by Kumar in order to

comb through data to find a particular piece of information.

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to combine the teachings of Hamilton , Kobayashi, admitted prior art, and

Kumar in order to provide a system to us a network protocol designed to work on

TCP/IP stacks to extract information.

Response to Arguments

The Office withdraws all previous rejections due to applicant's amendments.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2,5,6,11-16,22-27 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571) 272-5654. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Backhean Tiv
2151
1/21/08

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100